

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

IN RE APPLICATION OF: Yukio TSURUOKA, et al.

SERIAL NUMBER: 10/539,135 GROUP: 2432

FILED: June 16, 2005 EXAMINER: KIM, Jung W.

FOR: ADDRESS NOTIFYING APPARATUS AND ADDRESS NOTIFYING METHOD

COMMENTS ON STATEMENT OF REASONS FOR ALLOWANCE

MAIL STOP ISSUE FEE
COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. BOX 1450
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22313-1450

SIR:

Applicants acknowledge with appreciation the indication of allowability of the claimed invention. In response to the Examiner's Statement of Reasons for Allowance in the Notice of Allowance of March 11, 2010, Applicants respectfully submit the following comments.

In the Examiner's Statement of Reasons for Allowance on page 2 of the Notice of Allowance mailed March 11, 2010, paragraph 2 states "See pp. 2-3 of the Final rejection mailed 11/27/09 for the reasons for allowance." On page 4 of the Office Action of November 27, 2009 under the heading "Allowable Subject Matter" the paragraph states "Claims 1-7 are allowed for the reasons listed above," wherein on pages 2 and 3, paragraph 3 states in part:

Although it is well known to synchronize distinct databases in a manner whereby a sending node updates its database only when a successful update is made to a corresponding destination database, in the inventions of the two prior art references there is no reason for the sending node to only update its database after receiving a message from the destination node. In both Maeda and Tanaka, the inventions purport only to update sender information and not "linked information" as claimed by the applicant. "Linked information" ties a sender's address with a destination address, whereby corresponding linked information is stored at the destination side. See, for example, figures 7-12 of the instant application. Note that although Maeda discloses

transmission history, which effectively identifies a “link” between the sender and the destination, and updating the transmission history when an update message is transmitted to the destination, there is no reason for the transmission history to be updated only when the destination responds, because the history reflects destination addresses to whom the sender should send future updates. For these reasons, the prior art rejections are withdrawn.

The above comment does not appear to be accurate with respect to independent Claim 1.

For example, Claim 1 recites “a link change information sending part,” “a link information list” and a “link information change part” and not “a “sending node,” a “database” and a “destination node,” respectively. Also Claim 1 does not recite updating of a “transmission history.”

Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that the above quoted statement does not apply to independent Claim 1 (and claims dependent therefrom) to the extent the language used in the statement differs from the language of the claims.

Respectfully Submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,
MAIER & NEUSTADT, L.L.P.



James J. Kulbaski
Registration No. 34,648

Customer Number

22850

Tel. (703) 413-3000
Fax. (703) 413-2220
(OSMMN 07/09)

Craig R. Feinberg
Registration No. 62,116